

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated February 5, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on May 5, 2008. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 6, 8-11, 14, 18-21, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Davis* (US 6,346,702) in view of *Wang et al.* (*Wang et al.*: "Analysis and Suppression of Continuous Periodic Interference for On-Line PD Monitoring of Power Transformers," High Voltage Engineering Symposium, 22-27 August 1999, 5.212.P5) and *Lo et al.* (US 6,207,961) and *Lochmann et al.* (US 4,475,038).

Claims 1, 11 and 21 recite limitations that involve "removing noise." In this regard, the Examiner states that "Davis discloses... a noise reduction system (the combination of 32 and 34 in Figure 2B) for... removing noise produced by said noise producing element from said electrical signals (column 4 line 16-67, and a variable threshold is used to remove the background noise)." However, a variable threshold peak detection unit (reference number 32) and a spectral analysis device (34) disclosed in *Davis* lack any noise reduction functions. Instead of the variable threshold taught in *Davis* being used to remove noise, the threshold only identifies a level above which any signal must reach to not be considered noise. The passages cited by the Examiner relate to this setting of criteria applied against the signal that remains unchanged such that there is no indication of any removal of background noise as the Examiner contends.

Based on the foregoing, *Davis* lacks any "noise reduction system" to provide a basis for any modification with "other kinds" of such systems. Even if *Wang*, *Lo*, and *Lochmann* relate to removing noise efficiently, there is no nexus with the teachings of *Davis* given its silence with respect to noise reduction altogether (*i.e.*, a more efficient

noise reduction method is irrelevant). It is only the Examiner's mischaracterization of *Davis* that supports the modifications proposed.

Therefore, *Davis* in view of *Wang*, *Lo* and *Lochmann* fail to render obvious claim 1, 11 or 21. Further, all claims dependent on claims 1, 11 or 21 cannot be obvious over these references. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Claims 2, 12, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Davis et al.* and *Wang et al.* and *Lochmann et al.* and *Lo et al.* in further view of *Keown* (US 4,143,350). Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Davis et al.* and *Wang et al.* and *Lochmann et al.* and *Lo et al.* in view of *Kringlebotn* (US 6,097,487). Applicants submit that *Kringlebotn* or *Keown* fail to overcome the deficiencies of the other references as described above regarding the independent claims from which claims 2, 12, 16, 17 and 22 depend. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 2, 12, 16, 17 and 22.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants